



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,085	07/10/2000	John R. Ehrman	STL9-2000-0069	9432

24852 7590 11/12/2003

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP
IP LAW
555 BAILEY AVENUE, J46/G4
SAN JOSE, CA 95141

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/613,085

Applicant(s)

EHRMAN, JOHN R.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application, and IDS filed on 7/10/2000, and 2/2/2001 respectively.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-12 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 5, and 9 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 2/2/2001 has been considered.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 7/10/2000 have been accepted by the examiner.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 3, 7, and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities: the sentence “translation applies the subsequent portion of the computer program” line 2 of the claims, fails to point out what the translation applies to. This would be better written as: “translation applies to the subsequent portion of the computer program” Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2178

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edberg et al, hereinafter Edberg (Pat. # 5,793,381, 8/11/1998, as disclosed by the applicant on 2/2/2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, Edberg teaches a code converter stored in a computer readable medium for converting non-Unicode strings to Unicode looking up a mapping table—*retrieving a specification code page--* containing the Unicode or “second character encoding”, and the non-Unicode string encoding for converting to Unicode (col.3, lines 42-61, col.4, lines 10-67, and col. 11, line 47-col.12, line 67).

Furthermore, Edberg teaches a code converter stored in a computer readable medium for converting non-Unicode strings—*a scope--* to Unicode (col.3, lines 42-61, and col.4, lines 10-67). Edberg fails to explicitly disclose: *specifying a portion of a computer program subject to the translation*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have converted the portion of the computer program, because this would provide the benefit of allowing people of different nationalities to interact with the computer in a different language as taught by Edberg (col.1, lines 36-41). Thereby providing a user in a different language with the ability to interact with a program—strings—in another language.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Edberg teaches that the code converter converts the non-Unicode strings, such as all strings input into an email document—*global*

Art Unit: 2178

scope-- to Unicode (col.2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 57-61, and col.4, lines 10-67). Edberg fails to explicitly disclose: *the global scope specifying that the translation applies to the entire computer program*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have converted the portion of the computer program, because this would provide the benefit of allowing people of different nationalities to interact with the computer in a different language as taught by Edberg (col.1, lines 36-41). Thereby providing a user in a different language with the ability to interact with a program—document—in another language.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Edberg teaches a code converter stored in a computer readable medium for converting non-Unicode a single character or strings characters—a *constant--* to Unicode (col.3, lines 36-61, and col.4, lines 10-67). Edberg fails to explicitly disclose: *the local scope specifying that the translation applies the subsequent portion of the computer program*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have converted the subsequent portion of the computer program, because this would provide the benefit of allowing people of different nationalities to interact with the computer in a different language as taught by Edberg (col.1, lines 36-41). Thereby providing a user in a different language with the ability to interact with the subsequent characters in the computer program written in another language.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Edberg teaches a code converter stored in a computer readable medium for converting non-Unicode a single character—a *constant--* to Unicode (col.3, lines 36-61, and col.4, lines 10-67). Edberg fails to explicitly disclose: *the constant specific scope specifying that the translation applies only to a specific constant*.

Art Unit: 2178

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have converted the constant, because this would provide the benefit of allowing people of different nationalities to interact with the computer in a different language as taught by Edberg (col.1, lines 36-41). Thereby providing a user in a different language with the ability to interact with a character—*constant*—written in another language.

Claims 5-8 are directed towards a method for implementing the article of manufacture found in claims 1-4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 9-12 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the article of manufacture found in claims 1-4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tye (Pat. # 6,055,365), Lim et al. (Pat. # 5,689,723), Meade et al. (Pat. # 6,507,812), and **Enumerated Versions of the Unicode Standard**, <http://web.archive.org/web/20000304185841/www.unicode.org/unicode/standard/versions/enumeratedversions.html>, 1/31/2000.

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The

Art Unit: 2178

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



CESAR B PAULA
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

11/4/03